REMARKS

Claims 1-14, 25-31, 35 and 37-54 were examined by the Office, and in the Office Action of April 18, 2007 all claims are rejected. With this response claims 1, 4, 6-7, 13, 25, 28 30, 35, 37-38, 44, 50 and 53 are amended, and new claims 55-56 are added. All amendments and new claims are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following discussion.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

In section 5, on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-10, 13-14, 25-31, 37-47 and 50-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Berggren (WO 00/44130) in view of Turtiainen (U.S. Patent No. 6,430,407) and Bilgic et al. (U.S. Patent no. 6,097,817). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination, because the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is amended to clarify that a mobile client receives a subscriber identity sent from a mobile station, and the subscriber identity corresponds to a subscriber of a mobile telecommunication network. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, alone or in combination, at least fail to disclose or suggest receiving at a mobile client a subscriber identity sent from a mobile station, as recited in claim 1.

Berggren is directed to providing services on an Internet Protocol based network using an existing user authentication functionality applied from a digital cellular radio communication network. In Berggren, a user users a mobile station (162) to access a gateway node of a cellular communication network (120), the mobile station (162) contains an IC card (16) that stores subscriber information relating to a subscription to a cellular radio communication network. See Berggren page 10, lines 10-14; page 9, lines 29-31. The user may also use a second terminal (164), i.e. a personal computer (PC) to access the Internet (110). In order to authenticate activities provided by the internet connection, the user obtains a password from a gateway node (100) of the cellular communication network. See Berggren page 12, lines 6-7. The password received by the user is a Temporary PIN code (TPIN) that is associated with the MSISDN of the user. See Berggren page 13, lines 2-5. The TPIN is used by the user during the internet session with the Internet server (13) being accessed using the second terminal (164) by entering the

MSISDN as user id and TPIN as password in response to prompting by the server (130). See page 13, lines 17-20. This is performed using the second terminal (164). However, in contrast to claim 1, the subscriber identity, i.e. MSISDN is never sent from the mobile station (162) to the second terminal (164), but is instead entered by the user into the second terminal (164). As can be seen in Figure 1 of Berggren, there is no communication between the second terminal (164) and mobile station (162). Therefore, Berggren at least fails to disclose or suggest receiving at the mobile client the subscriber identity sent from the mobile station, wherein the mobile station is separate from the mobile client as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, Turtiainen fails to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Berggren, because Turtiainen also fails to disclose or suggest receiving at a mobile client a subscriber identity sent form a mobile station. While applicant acknowledges that Turtiainen discusses that the mobile station (1) and user interface (16) may directly communicate with each other through a suitable operational connection, Turtiainen never discloses or suggests that the subscriber identity is ever sent to the user interface (16), whether input by the user or through an operational connection. Instead, Turtiainen only discloses that transactions can be acknowledged by sending the details of the transaction to the MS PAD (35) to ensure correctness by means of a checksum calculated by the MS PAD (35) in accordance with a predefined algorithm and utilizing the secret of the SIM (34). See Turtiainen column 9, lines 59-65. The checksum has to match with the sum displayed by the user terminal (16). However, the sum displayed by the user terminal (16) is transmitted by the application to the user terminal, and is not provided by the mobile station (1), either directly or through user input. See Turtiainen column 8, lines 60-65 (application retrieves user related authentication data from an appropriate database and sends a text message to the mobile station). Therefore, Turtiainen also fails to disclose or suggest receiving at the mobile client the subscriber identity sent from the mobile station, as recited in claim 1.

In addition, Turtiainen also fails to disclose or suggest the first secret and the second secret recited in claim 1. Turtiainen only discloses that an application (60) provides a challenge (61) to a user (22), which may then be entered into or communicated with a mobile station (1) of the user. See Turtiainen column 10, lines 22-28. A secret stored in the SIM of the mobile station (1) may be used to calculate an answer (27, 62) that may be used to authenticate the user interface (16) to the application (60). However, the secret stored in the SIM is never transmitted

to the user interface (16), and furthermore the application (60) only transmits the challenge (61) to the user interface (16), and not at least one first secret based on a subscriber's secret specific to the subscriber identity, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, none of the cited references disclose or suggest receiving at the mobile client at least one first secret, and at least one second secret, and even if the references are combined they still fail to disclose or suggest these limitations recited in claim 1.

Bilgic does not make up for the deficiencies identified above with respect to the teachings of Berggren and Turtiainen. Therefore, since the cited references individually fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1, it necessarily follows that even if the references are combined they will also fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. Instead, Bilgic is directed to a communication system having a wireless trunk for connecting multiple phone lines over wireless communication links to a cellular network that includes a central telephone switch connected through one or more trunk lines to a wireless access communication unit. Bilgic does not disclose or suggest receiving at a mobile client a subscriber identity sent from a mobile station, where the mobile station is separate from the mobile client, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Bilgic fails to make up for the deficiencies recited in claim 1, and the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the lmitations recited in claim 1. See MPEP § 2143.03.

Furthermore, applicant respectfully submits that there is no motivation or suggestion to combine the teachings of the cited references to arrive at the limitations recited in claim 1. The cited references, as discussed above, do not disclose or suggest sending a subscriber identity to a mobile client from a mobile station. Instead, the cited references, at most disclose sending such information from a communications network. One of skill in the art would not be motivated to modify the references so that the subscriber identity is provided from the mobile station instead of the communication network(s). Therefore, for at least this additional reason, claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Independent claims 13, 25, 30, 35, 37, 38 and 50 all contain limitations similar to those recited in claim 1, and are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1, claims 13, 25, 30, 35 37, 38 and 50 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination, and applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections to these claims.

Claims 2-10, 14, 26-29, 31, 39-47 and 51-54 all ultimately depend from an independent claim, and are patentable over the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

In section 6, on page 7 of the Office Action, claims 11-12 and 48-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Berggren in view of Turtiainen and Bilgic, and in further view of Lightman (U.S. Patent No. 6,711,414). Claims 11-12 and 48-49 ultimately depend from an independent claim, and are patentable over the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

New Claims 55-56

New claims 55 and 56 ultimately depend from an independent claim, and therefore are believed to be patentable over the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

Conclusion

The rejections of the Office Action having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowable and such action is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commission to charge any fee deficiency required to submit this response to Deposit Account No. 23-0442.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 15 August 2007

Keith R. Obert
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

KRO/kas
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone:(203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
Customer No. 004955